to consider this matter in a more realistic way than merely sticking to the old arguments that the previous wage board award is there and the Government of India is thinking of constituting another wage board etc., Till they constitute a new Wage Board, and till they give report and make recommendations, there is no use of keeping quiet. The situation demands and everybody feels that there is a case to increase the emoluments of those employees. I again appeal to those who are in the management to consider seriously this matter and do something in this matter. If they don't do I don't know whether there is any legal provisions etc., in this.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—Then, you know how to use 'Danda'.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—I suggest let there be a meeting in this matter.

SRI D DEVARAJ URS.—We actually did meet more than once. Now, simply by seeing the badges worn by them, we can come to the conclusion that nothing has been done.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—Everybody feels that it is good that you have convened a meeting.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.— It looks that they have not done anything.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೋಣಂದೂರು ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ:—ವೇತನ ಮಂಡಲಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವೇನಾದರೂ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

(ಉತ್ತರ ಇಲ್ಲ).

NOTICE ON QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE:

Re : introduction of Karnataka Ministers Service and Allowances (Amendement Bill 1975 in the Legislative Council).

SRI S. BANGARAPPA (Sorab)-Madam Speaker, Yesterday, some of the hon. Members sitting on this side, raised a matter relating to the rejection of the Bill in the Legislative Council, which according to us is a Money Bill, according to the provisions of the Constitution of India. Before you give your ruling in this matter, I draw your attention to Art, 198, Clause (1) of the constitution of India. It says like this:

> "Money Bill shall not be introduced in the Legislative Council".

To satisfy this, we will have to consider whether this is a Money Bill or not.

Article 199 of the Constitution gives a list of matters under which a Bill can be treated as a *Money* Bill. *Now*, sub-clauses [d] and [e] read as follows:

> (d) the appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of the State:
>
> (e) the declaring of any expenditure to be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State, or the increasing of the amount of any such expenditure;

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—1969ರಲ್ಲೇ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ತಾವೂ ಕೂಡ ಆಗ ಇದ್ದಿರಬೇಕು. ನಾನು ಇದರ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿ ಓದಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಮನಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆ. ಪುನಃ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಏಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅಂತಹ ವಿಶೇಷ ಇಲ್ಲ.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA:...If you, Madam, give a ruling that the bill which was introduced in the Legislative Council and rejected by it is not a Money Bill, certainly we have no case and we will abide by your ruling. But if we prove that it is a Money Bill and therefore it ought not to have been introduced in the Legislative

Council but should have been introduced in this House, we hope you will allow us to move this privilege motion. The Bill deals with the payment of extra allowances to the Ministers who go abroad by way of T. A. and D. A. Where do they get this money from ? This money will have to be charged on the Consolidated Fund only. Therefore, sub-clauses (d) and (e) of article 199 are attracted. This Bill which ought not to have been introduced in the Legislative Council was introduced there and the same has been rejected by that House. As the Legislative Council has rejected this Bill, the Government should immediately resign on this point. That House has got obligatory functions and it has got so many powers. I therefore request the Chair to give a considered ruling on this issue. We have sent a notice of privilege against the Government on the ground that Bill is a Money Bill and that it has not been introduced here. We also request you to allow us to move this privilege motion because they have not introduced that bill here but have introduced it in the Legislative Council.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN :....In addition to the point raised by Sri Bangarappa, I want to point out that there is a distinction between what happened now and what happened in 1969. At that time it was a question of increasing, I think, the allowances and salaries of the members of the legislature. Here, in the present Bill, the words used are 'travelling and other expenses'. So, there is a difference.

MADAM SPEAKER :.... The hon. Member Sri S. Bangarappa has contended that the privilege of this House is violated by the Government in introducing the Karnatak Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1975 in the Legislative Council. Some other hon. Members also supported the point raised by Sri Bangarappa Their contention was that the Bill is a Money Bill and cannot be introduced in the Legislative Council. Yester-

(Madam Speaker)

day itself I made an observation that the Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill was not a Money Bill and therefore it could be introduced in the Legislative Council. I, however, promised to further examine the matter. I have once again considered the whole matter. Under article 198 of the Constitution, a Money Bill cannot be introduced in the Legislative Council. What a Money Bill is, defined in article 199 of the Constitution. A Bill involving only expenditure from the Consolidated Fuud of the State is not treated as a Money Bill. In fact, on an earlier occasion a bill entitled 'The Karnataka Legislature Salaries and Allowances (Amendment Bill' which also involved expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of the State was introduced in the Legislative Council and it came before this House subsequently. A similar objection was taken here. Elaborate arguments were advanced on that occasion and my predecessor give rulings on 27-8-1969 that it was not a Money Bill. I may draw the attention of the House to another Bill viz. the Karnataka Legislature Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill which was also first introduced in the Legislative Council and was passed here subsequently in the current session itself. I am, therefore, of the opinion that such Bill whjch involve expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of the State are not Money Bills within the meaning of article 199 of the Constitution and they can be introduced in the Legislative Council also. Hence no question of privilege arises in the matter.

LETTING WATER TO LANDS PETITIONED BY SRI K. LINGAPPA AND OTHERS

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೋಣಂದೂರು ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).....ರೂಲ್ 312ರ ಕೆಳಗಡೆ ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ ಈಗ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.